DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 330 739 UD 027 938

AUTHOR Chamberlain, Ed
TITLE Home, School, and Adult Instruction Component, Home-School-Community Agents Project. Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Columbus Public Schools, OH. Dept. of Program Evaluation.
PUB DATE Nov 90
NOTE 47p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adjustment (to Environment); *Behavior Problems; *Dropout Prevention; *Dropout Programs; *Family School Relationship; High Risk Students; High Schools; High School Students; Intermediate Grades; Middle Schools; Questionnaires; *School Community Relationship; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS Columbus Public Schools OH; *Ohio (Columbus)

ABSTRACT

This evaluation of the 1989-90 Home-School-Community Agent (HSCA) Project in Columbus (Ohio) found mixed success. The role of the HSCA was to help disruptive pupils make positive adjustments to those elements in their lives that interfered with their success in school. Nineteen HSCAs were each assigned 60 "disruptive" students drawn from 11 middle schools and 8 high schools. Evaluation information for a sample of program participants was drawn from the following: (1) pretest-posttest scores on a measure of student attitudes and the probability of dropping out; (2) student background information; (3) student and staff surveys; (4) HSCA activity logs; and (5) evaluations of HSCA inservice training sessions. The following findings are reported: (1) less than 50 percent of the participants demonstrated improved attitudes and a lower probability of dropping out at the end of the program; (2) more than 50 percent of the participants demonstrated improvement in relation to the original reasons for their referral to the program; (3) the students and staff thought that the HSCA's role as liaison between the school, the home, and the community was important; and (4) HSCAs did not find most of the inservice training sessions to be helpful. Statistical data are presented in 16 tables. Six tables of statistical data illustrating dropout probabilities by grade, and copies of seven evaluation instruments are appended. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED330739

Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
HOME SCHOOL AND ADULT INSTRUCTION COMPONENT
HOME-SCHOOL-COMMUNITY AGENTS PROJECT

November 1990

Written by:

Ed Chamberlain
Professional Specialist

Under the Supervision of

E. Jane Williams, Ph.D.

Computer Analysis by:

Kathy Morgan
Professional Specialist

Under the Supervision of

Richard A. Amorose, Ph.D.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gary E. Thompson
Columbus Pub. Schools

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools
Department of Program Evaluation
Gary Thompson, Ph.D., Director

UD027938

EVALSRVCS/P509/RPTFHSC90

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
HOME SCHOOL AND ADULT INSTRUCTION COMPONENT
HOME-SCHOOL-COMMUNITY AGENTS PROJECT
1989-90

ABSTRACT

Program Description: The primary purpose of the Home-School-Community Agent (HSCA) Project is to help disruptive pupils make a positive adjustment to those elements in their lives that interfere with their success in school. As defined by the HSCA project, "disruptive" refers to any action or behavior which interrupts the educational process in or out of school.

Time Interval: The HSCA project started on August 28, 1990 and continued through the 1989-90 school year. Implementation of the project was accomplished by 19 Home-School-Community Agents (HSCA) who served in eight high schools and 11 middle schools.

Activities: Each HSCA worked on an in-depth basis with approximately 60 pupils who had been identified as disruptive. Each HSCA was asked to designate 20 of these pupils for inclusion in the evaluation sample. In addition to direct contact with project pupils, the HSCA served as a home-school-community liaison to promote understanding and to assist pupils in their adjustment to the school environment.

Program Objective: Of the selected pupils served by the HSCA, 50% of the pupils will show a more positive attitude toward teachers, education, and school behavior and will demonstrate a positive adjustment to those elements of the pupils' lives which interfere with their success in school. The HSCA will serve as a liaison to the home, school, and community to promote understanding and provide assistance for the adjustment of pupils to the school environment.

Evaluation Design: The evaluation design for the HSCA Project called for the collection of data using the Demos D Scale (provides a measure of pupil attitudes and the probability of dropping out of school), Pupil Entry Information Sheet (provides individual pupil data on those elements obstructing pupil achievement), Pupil Census Form (provides pupil information and HSCAs' ratings of pupil progress), Pupil Questionnaire (provides pupils' perceptions regarding the HSCAs' activities), Professional Staff Survey (provides school staff perceptions regarding the role of the HSCA), and the HSCA Log Sheet (provides documentation of HSCAs' activities).

Major Findings: Complete pretest-posttest data on the Demos D Scale (DDS) were collected for 194 (51.1%) of the 380 pupils in the evaluation sample. Of the 194 pupils in the testing sample, 17 pupils (8.8%) had a lower probability of dropping out, while 21 pupils (10.8%) had a higher probability of dropping out at the end of the treatment period. Of these pupils, 83 (42.8%) demonstrated some positive change in their attitude toward teachers, education, and school behavior. This did not meet the project criterion of improvement in attitudes by 50% of project pupils.

Statistically significant improvement was indicated in grade 11 on the three attitude scales regarding teachers, education, and school behavior, as well as on the total score. Statistically significant change in the wrong direction was found on these same scales at grade 7. Improvement in attitudes

toward teachers was found in grades 6, 9, and 11. Improvement in attitudes toward education was found in grades 6, 9, and 12. Improvement regarding influence by peers or parents occurred in grades 6, 10, and 11, and in the total average across grades. Improvement of attitudes toward school behavior occurred in grades 6, 10, and 11. Improvements in terms of the total score occurred in grades 6, 9, 10, and 11. According to the dropout probabilities provided by the test publisher, the pupils in the evaluation sample had, on the average, approximately a 50% chance of dropping out before and after their involvement in the project.

A pupil may be referred to the HSCA program for one or more reasons. Of the 380 pupils in the evaluation sample, 98 (25.8%) were referred for a single reason, and 101 (26.6%) were referred for two reasons. Three or more reasons were given for referral for 181 (47.6%) of the pupils in the sample. The three most frequent referral reasons in the overall program (N=380) were poor grades (140 pupils or 36.8%), disruptiveness (132 pupils or 34.7%), and hostility to authority (120 pupils or 31.6%). In middle school (n=220) the three most frequent referral reasons were disruptiveness (94 pupils or 42.7%), poor grades (84 pupils or 38.2%), and peer conflict (73 pupils or 33.2%). The three most frequent referral reasons in high school (n=160) were attendance problem (58 pupils or 36.2%), poor grades (56 pupils or 35.0%), and class cutting (56 pupils or 35.0%.

The HSCAs indicated that 255 (67.3%) of the 379 pupils having complete pupil census data showed evidence of improvement in relation to their original referral reasons, 218 (57.5%) showed academic improvement, and 267 (70.4%) improved socially. Among the 236 pupils responding to the Pupil Questionnaire, pupils reported that they were getting along better with their teachers (80.5%), families (40.3%), and friends (39.0%) since talking with the HSCA. Of the 125 administrators and teachers who responded to the Professional Staff Survey, 102 (81.6%) reported improvement among the pupils they had referred to the HSCA for assistance.

Analysis of the HSCA Log Sheet indicated that the average HSCAs week included 38.7 contacts involving individual or group guidance for a total of 9.7 hours; 33.8 liaison activities involving parents, school personnel, and/or community agencies for a total of 9.7 hours; and 5.7 hours served in various school support activities. Analysis of the Professional Staff Survey indicted that 124 (99.2%) of the 125 respondents viewed the HSCA role of home-school-community liaison to be important.

An objective dealing with inservice meetings was not met because one of the four meetings received favorable ratings from less than the requisite 80% of HSCAs. However, the percent of positive ratings over all four meetings was 87.7%.

The data collected for the Home-School-Community Agent project presented mixed findings. Although the project was considered valuable by pupils, HSCAs, and school staff, improvement of pupil attitudes as measured by the Demos D Scale was less than desired. The project met two of its four objectives. Since the project is not scheduled to be continued in the 1990-91 school year, it is recommended that alternative methods and/or program(s) be established to fill the needs which the program addressed.

Note: At the time of the original writing of this report as administrative decision had been made to discontinue the HSCA program. However, this decision was later reversed. The program has been implemented in the 1990-91 school year.

Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
HOME SCHOOL AND ADULT INSTRUCTION COMPONENT
HOME-SCHOOL-COMMUNITY AGENTS PROJECT

November 1990

Program Description

The Home-School-Community Agents project has been operating in the Columbus Public Schools since the 1968-69 school year. The overall goal is to help disruptive pupils make a positive adjustment to those elements in their lives that interfere with their success in school. As defined by the HSCA project, "disruptive" refers to any action or behavior which interrupts the educational process of the pupil in or out of the school.

To reach the 1989-90 project goal, 19 Home-School-Community Agents (HSCA) served 8 high schools and 11 middle schools. The schools are listed below:

High Schools	Middle Schools	
Centennial	Barrett	Medina
Briggs	Beery	Mohawk
Brookhaven	Crestview	Starling
East	Eastmoor	Wedgewood
Linden McKinley	Everett	Westmoor
South	Indianola	
West		
Whetstone		

Each HSCA worked on an in-depth basis with approximately 60 pupils who had been identified as disruptive. Each HSCA was asked to designate 20 of these pupils for inclusion in the evaluation sample. In addition to direct contact with project pupils, the HSCA served as a home-school-community liaison to promote understanding and to assist pupils in their adjustment to the school environment.

Evaluation Objectives

Objective 1.0 Of the selected pupils who are served by the HSCA for the treatment period, 50% of the pupils will show a more positive attitude toward teachers, education, and school behavior.

Objective 2.0 At the culmination of the agent-pupil sessions, 50% of the selected pupils will demonstrate a positive adjustment to those elements of the pupils' lives which interfere with their success in school.

Criterion 2.1 Identification of "disruptive" elements and/or pupil concern which appear to be obstructing pupil achievement.

Criterion 2.2 Evidence of positive adjustments of at least 50% of selected pupils.

Objective 3.0 To serve as a home-school-community liaison to promote understanding and to provide assistance for the adjustment of pupils to the school environment.

Criterion 3.1 80% of the pupils served will perceive that the HSCA promoted understanding and provided assistance for the adjustment to the school environment.

Criterion 3.2 80% of the professional staff who referred pupils to the HSCA will perceive that the HSCA promoted understanding and provided assistance to pupils to the school environment.

Objective 4.0 To provide at least two inservice sessions to program personnel such that at least 80% of the inservice participants will rate each session as valuable in providing information that will assist them in carrying out their program responsibilities.

Evaluation Design

The evaluation design for the HSCA Project called for the collection of data in seven areas. Except for the Demos D Scale a copy of each instrument used in the evaluation is found in Appendix B.

1. Pupil Attitude Information

The Demos D Scale (DDS; Demos, 1970) provides a measure of pupil attitudes and the probability of dropping out of school. The pretest was given during the period of October 16-25, 1989 and the posttest was given in the period of April 2-12, 1990.

The DDS is composed of 29 items that yield four Basic Area Scores and a Total Score. Pupils are asked to rate each item on a 5-point scale that, except for one item, ranges from "nearly always" to "nearly never". Higher scores indicate a poorer attitude and a higher probability of dropping out of school. The four Basic Area Scores and Total Score are as follows:

T (Teachers): Deals with attitudes toward teachers, counselors, and administrators. This area is comprised of 10 items with scores ranging from 10-50.

E (Education): Deals with attitudes toward education, training, and college. This area is comprised of nine items with scores ranging from 9-45.

P (Peers): Deals with attitudes toward peers and parents. This area is comprised of five items with scores ranging from 5-25.

S (School): Deals with attitudes toward school behavior. This area is comprised of five items with scores ranging from 5-25.

Total Score: The text publisher indicates that, based on the results of clinical experience, this is the best predictor of dropping out of school. Scores range from 29-145.

The test publisher cites six uses for the DDS. First, it provides an objective method for obtaining expressions of attitudes related to dropping out of school. The DDS is of special help in working with junior and senior high school students. Second, it identifies students with strongly negative attitudes toward teachers and school, so preventive or corrective work can take place while students still are in school. Third, the instrument can make it possible to alert parents of children who indicate that they may drop out of school. Fourth, data can be provided about students to facilitate the counseling or psychotherapy of problem children. Fifth, data can be used to structure or develop school programs for identifying and working with potential dropouts so schools can be of help in reducing dropouts. Sixth, the instrument can provide a research approach in areas such as dropping out of school, adjusting to school, attitude formation, effective learning, etc.

2. Pupil Entry Information

The Pupil Entry Information Sheet (see Appendix B, page 34) provided individual pupil data on those elements obstructing pupil achievement which formed the basis for assigning pupils to the project. It also identified the person referring the pupil to the project. It was completed by the HSCAs and collected in October 1989.

3. Pupil Census Information

HSCAs completed a Pupil Census Form (see Appendix B, page 35) for each pupil in the evaluation sample. These forms were collected in April 1990. Pupil Census Forms provided individual data on nine items: pupil involvement with the court, number of months in the project, number of contacts with the pupil, number of in-school conferences with the pupil, number of home visits made regarding the pupil, pupil referral to a community agency, and assessment of the pupils' adjustment in three areas: academic improvement, social progress, and final outcome regarding original referral reasons.

4. Pupil Questionnaire Information

The Pupil Questionnaire was used to survey pupils in the evaluation sample to determine their perceptions of the HSCA's role in providing adjustment to the home-school-community environment, and to provide evidence of pupils' adjustment to school. The instrument was administered in February 1990. See Appendix B, page 36, for a copy of the Pupil Questionnaire.

5. Professional Staff Survey Information

The Professional Staff Survey was designed to determine perceptions of school professional staff regarding the HSCA role as a liaison between the school and the home and community. It was administered in February 1990 to those members of school professional staffs who had referred pupils for inclusion in the HSCA Project, as determined from the Pupil Entry Information Sheet. A copy of the Professional Staff Survey is found on page 37, Appendix B.

6. HSCA Log Information

The purpose of the HSCA Weekly Log Sheet (see Appendix B, page 38) was to provide documentation of a Home-School-Community Agent's activities in a selected week. The instrument was completed twice by each HSCA during the period of December 4, 1989 - March 9, 1990. Specific weeks to be logged were assigned randomly.

7. Inservice Evaluation Information

The General Inservice Evaluation Form was used to document the number of inservice meetings held and obtain the ratings of HSCAs regarding the value of inservice that was provided. A modified version of the form was used for the orientation meeting of September 5, 1989. Ratings were obtained in the following areas: how worthwhile the meeting was, usefulness of the information presented, time available to ask questions, and how adequately questions were answered. The rating scale used was (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, and (5) Strongly Agree. The General Inservice Evaluation Form and the modified version used in the orientation meeting are both found in Appendix B, pages 39-41. Dates and topics of HSCA inservice meetings were as follows:

Date	Topic
September 5, 1989	Orientation for the 1989-90 School Year
October 2, 1989	Case Management and Follow-Through
November 6, 1989	The Columbus Area Community Health Center's Adolescent Outreach Program
December 4, 1989	Juvenile Narcotics Section and Youth Violence/Crime Section of Columbus Police Department; Columbus Public Schools PEAK and I-PASS Programs

Major Findings

The evaluation sample consisted of 380 pupils who were randomly selected from the 1,140 pupils served by the project. The grade and sex of sample pupils are presented in Table 1. The sample was comprised of 126 girls and 254 boys.

Table 1

Grade and Sex of Pupils
in the Evaluation Sample

Grade	Pupils Served	Girls	Boys
6	48	21	27
7	96	33	63
8	76	27	49
9	73	23	50
10	42	7	35
11	24	5	19
12	20	10	10
20*	1	0	1
Total	380	126	254

*Transferred from grade ten to Adult High School

Objective 1.0 required that 50% of the group of selected pupils who were served by the HSCA for the entire treatment period would show improvement in their attitude toward the school environment. The pupils were pretested during the period of October 16-25, 1989 and posttested during the period of April 2-12, 1990 with the Demos D Scale (DDS). The DDS yields four Basic Area Scores and a Total Score which provide data to be compared with the standardization group. The interpretation of DDS scores is as follows: the higher the score the greater the probability of dropping out of school. If it can be assumed that pupils with a high probability of dropping out of school have a poor attitude about teachers and school behavior, a lower posttest score on the DDS should be one indication of a "positive" change in attitude.

Matched pretest-posttest total scores for the DDS were collected for 194 (51.1%) of the 380 pupils in the evaluation sample. Of these pupils, 83 (42.8%) demonstrated a positive change in their attitude toward teachers, education, and school behavior. Thus the Objective (1.0) of 50% was not attained.

Table 2 contains descriptive data regarding the pretest-posttest DDS Basic Area Scores and Total Score reported by grade level. Improvement in attitudes toward teachers was found in grades 6, 9, and 11. Improvement in attitude toward education was found in grades 6, 9, 11, and 12. Improvement in influence by peers and parents occurred in grades 6, 10, and 11, and in the total average across grades. Improvement in attitudes toward school behavior occurred in grades 6, 10, and 11. Improvement in terms of total score occurred in grades 6, 9, 10, and 11. In grades 6 and 11 there was improvement of average scores in all four Demos D subtests and in the total score. Grades 7 and 8, on the other hand, showed no improvement on any subtest in regard to average scores. Application of t-tests indicated significant differences at two grade levels. In grade seven, where the differences were in the wrong direction, the changes in the scales regarding attitude toward teachers and attitude toward school behavior were significant at the .05 level, while the changes regarding attitude toward education and the total score were significant at the .01 level. Significant improvement was indicated at grade 11 in attitude toward education and attitude toward school behavior (both at the .05 level) and in attitude toward teachers and the total score (both at the .01 level). According to the dropout probabilities provided by the test publisher, the pupils in the evaluation sample had, on the average, approximately a 50%

Table 2

Pretest, Posttest and Change Means for Demos D Scale (DDS) Basic Area Scores and Total Score Reported By Grade Level 1989-90

Grade Level		T Attitudes Towards Teachers	E Attitudes Toward Education	P Influence by Peers and Parents	S Attitudes Toward School Behavior	Total Score
6	Number of Pupils	25	26	26	26	25
	Pretest Mean	27.4	18.3	12.7	11.3	69.1
	Posttest Mean	26.0	17.2	12.2	10.8	66.3
	Change in Mean	- 1.4	- 1.2	- 0.5	- 0.5	- 2.8
7	Number of Pupils	45	45	45	45	45
	Pretest Mean	23.0	13.6	11.0	9.4	56.9
	Postteset Mean	25.5	15.5	10.9	10.5	62.4
	Change in Mean	2.6*	1.9**	0.0	1.1*	5.5**
8	Number of Pupils	39	39	39	39	39
	Pretest Mean	24.5	16.1	10.8	10.6	62.0
	Posttest Mean	25.7	17.1	11.1	11.2	65.2
	Change in Mean	1.2	1.0	0.3	0.6	3.2
9	Number of Pupils	34	34	34	34	34
	Pretest Mean	26.4	18.5	11.6	12.4	68.9
	Posttest Mean	25.8	17.8	11.6	12.5	67.7
	Change in Mean	- 0.6	- 0.7	0.0	0.0	- 1.2
10	Number of Pupils	19	19	19	19	19
	Pretest Mean	26.1	15.9	10.2	10.4	62.5
	Posttest Mean	26.1	15.9	9.9	10.0	61.9
	Change in Mean	0.1	0.0	- 0.3	- 0.4	- 0.6
11	Number of Pupils	17	17	17	17	17
	Pretest Mean	28.4	20.1	11.9	12.9	73.3
	Posttest Mean	22.8	16.1	10.2	10.4	59.5
	Change in Mean	- 5.5**	- 4.0*	- 1.7	- 2.5*	-13.8**
12	Number of Pupils	15	15	15	15	15
	Pretest Mean	25.1	15.3	9.8	10.1	60.3
	Posttest Mean	25.7	15.0	9.9	10.6	61.3
	Change in Mean	0.7	- 0.3	0.1	0.5	1.0
Total	Number of Pupils	194	195	195	195	194
	Pretest Mean	25.4	16.5	11.2	10.9	63.9
	Posttest Mean	25.5	16.5	11.0	11.0	64.0
	Change in Mean	0.1	0.0	- 0.2	0.1	0.1

Note. A negative change indicates improvement.

Note. In some cases, the "Change in Mean" may appear to be a tenth of a point off from the apparent difference between pretest and posttest means. This is due to rounding error. All mean scores (pretest, posttest and change) were computed to four decimal places, but are rounded to the nearest tenth in this table.

*$p < .05$
**$p < .01$

chance of dropping out before and after their involvement in the project. The probabilities are expressed as the chance of dropping out per 100 pupils. The data in Figure 1 show that of the 194 pupils in the Demos D evaluation sample, 17 pupils (8.8%) had a lower probability of dropping out, and 21 pupils (10.8%) had a higher probability of dropping out at the end of the treatment period. This same information is reported by grade level in Appendix A, pages 26-32.

Objective 2.0 requires as a final outcome that 50% of the selected pupils demonstrate a positive adjustment to those elements in their lives which interfere with their success in school. Criterion 2.1 requires the identification of those elements obstructing pupil achievement. The Pupil Entry Information Sheet is used to collect data on Criterion 2.1. Criterion 2.2 requires evidence of positive adjustment of at least 50% of the selected pupils. Data for Criterion 2.2, as well as additional data, are collected using the Pupil Census Forms.

The Pupil Entry Information Sheet provided data on who referred pupils and why they were referred to the HSCA. Table 3, page 9, contains a ranking of the referral reasons by frequency and percent for each school level. The frequencies and percents in this table are not additive since a pupil could be referred for more than one reason.

The three most frequent referral reasons in the overall program (N=380) were poor grades (36.8%), disruptiveness (34.7%), and hostility to authority (31.6%). In middle school (N=220) the three most frequent referral reasons were disruptiveness (42.7%), poor grades (38.2%) and peer conflict (33.2%). The three most frequent referral reasons in high school (N=160) were attendance problem (36.2%), poor grades (35.0%), and class cutting (35.0%).

As has been indicated, a pupil may be referred to the HSCA program for one or more of the reasons indicated in Table 3. Table 4 summarizes the number of reasons for which individual students were referred. Over one-fourth of the students (25.8%) were referred for a single reason, and over one-fourth (26.6%) were referred for two reasons. Three or more referral reasons were given for nearly half (47.6%) of the pupils in the sample.

The first criterion for Objective 2.0 was met. As indicated from the data above, the Pupil Entry Information Sheet served to identify the problem areas appearing to obstruct the achievement of individual pupils. Data regarding positive adjustment to the problem areas, as well as additional data, were collected using the Pupil Census Forms. It should be noted that the following data from the analysis of Pupil Census Forms are based on a sample of 379 pupils instead of the original 380 pupils. This is because data for one tenth grade pupil were not retrievable due to an error in the school system's Student Master File.

		Posttest Dropout Probability Categories					
		5	25	50	70	90	Total
Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	25	0 0.0	0 0.0	4 2.1	0 0.0	0 0.0	4 2.1
	50	0 0.0	0 0.0	153 78.9	9 4.6	4 2.1	166 85.6
	70	0 0.0	0 0.0	4 2.1	1 0.5	4 2.1	9 4.6
	90	0 0.0	0 0.0	12 6.2	1 0.5	2 1.0	15 7.7
	Total	0 0.0	0 0.0	173 89.2	11 5.7	10 5.2	194 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 1. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on Demos D Total Score Across Grades

Table 3

Frequency and Ranking of Reasons for Referral to HSCA Program by School Level

	Total Component (Grades 6-12) n=380			Middle School (Grades 6-8) n=220			High School (Grades 9-12) n=160		
Referral Reason	Rank	Frequency	%	Rank	Frequency	%	Rank	Frequency	%
Poor Grades	1	140	36.8	2	84	38.2	2.5	56	35.0
Disruptive	2	132	34.7	1	94	42.7	9	38	23.8
Hostile to Authority	3	120	31.6	4	66	30.0	5	54	33.8
Poor Attitude	4	116	30.5	5	63	28.6	6	53	33.1
Teacher Conflict	5	115	30.3	6	60	27.3	4	55	34.4
Peer Conflict	6	114	30.0	3	73	33.2	8	41	25.6
Attendance Problem	7	108	28.4	8	50	22.7	1	58	36.2
Family/Home Problem	8	103	27.1	7	51	23.2	7	52	32.5
Class Cutting	9	85	22.4	10	29	13.2	2.5	56	35.0
Truancy	10	67	17.6	9	37	16.8	10.5	30	18.8
Law-Court Conflict	11	44	11.6	1	14	6.4	10.5	30	18.8
Drugs/Alcohol	12	28	7.4	12	10	4.5	12	18	11.2
Other	13	14	3.7	13.5	4	1.8	13	10	6.2
Health Problem	14	8	2.1	13.5	4	1.8	14	4	2.5

Table 4
Frequency and Percent of Number of Reasons for
Pupil Referrals to the HSCA Program

Number of Reasons for Referral	Frequency	Percent
1	98	25.8
2	101	26.6
3	65	17.1
4	31	8.2
5	27	7.1
6	18	4.7
7	13	3.4
8	10	2.6
9	10	2.6
10	6	1.6
11	1	0.3
Total	380	100.0

The Pupil Census Forms provided individual data on pupil involvement with the court. Analysis of these data indicated that 159 (41.9%) of the 379 pupils in the Pupil Census Form sample had been involved with the court.

Table 5 presents the number of months pupils were served by the project. These data include any service received previous to the present school year. A majority of pupils in the evaluation sample (222) had been served by the project for 6 to 10 months. An additional 67 were served for 11 months or more. Thus, a considerable proportion of the pupils have been served by the project for one or more years.

Table 5

Number and Percent of Pupils
by Months of HSCA Service

Number of Months	Number of Pupils	Percent of Pupils
1-5	90	23.7
6-10	222	58.6
11-15	36	9.5
16-20	23	6.1
21-25	1	0.3
More than 25	7	1.8
Total	379	100.0

HSCAs were asked to indicate the number of contacts made with each pupil. Analysis of these data indicates that 285 (75.2%) of the pupils in the evaluation sample were seen seven or more times. The number of pupils who were seen eleven or more times was 159, or 42.0%. Therefore a large portion of the HSCA's time is spent in conferences. HSCAs indicated that four or more in-school conferences were held regarding 267 (70.4%) of the pupils in the evaluation sample. In addition, four or more home visits were made involving 99 (26.1%) of the pupils. The data relating to pupil contacts are contained in Table 6. An additional type of contact HSCAs made on behalf of pupils was referral to community agencies. HSCAs indicated that they had made such referrals for 184 (48.5%) of their pupils.

Table 6

Frequency of HSCA Contacts, In-school Conferences,
and Home Visits with Each Pupil
N=379

	Number of Contacts					
	None	1-3	4-6	7-10	11 or More	No Response
Contacts with the pupil	0	23	71	126	159	0
In school conferences held regarding this pupil	9	103	122	80	65	0
Home visits made regarding this pupil	52	228	69	15	15	0

HSCAs also rated each pupil's final outcome in relation to academic improvement, progress in social adjustment, and the original reasons for the pupil's referral. The following change categories were used: Marked Improvement, Improvement, or No Improvement. The final outcome ratings of the 380 pupils in the evaluation sample are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7

Number and Percent of Pupils on
Three Outcome Measures by Degree of Improvement

	Academic Improvement		Social Adjustment		Referral Reasons	
Change	Number of Pupils	Percent of Pupils	Number of Pupils	Percent of Pupils	Number of Pupils	Percent of Pupils
Marked Improvement	51	13.5	62	16.4	68	17.9
Improvement	167	44.1	205	54.1	187	49.3
No Improvement	161	42.5	112	29.6	124	32.7
Not Answered	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	379	100.0	379	100.0	379	100.0

The second criterion of Objective 2.0 required evidence of positive adjustment by at least 50% of the selected pupils. Table 7 shows that 255 (67.3%) of the pupils in the sample were rated as having derived some benefit ("Improvement" or "Marked Improvement") from the project in relation to their original Referral Reasons. In addition, 218 (57.5%) were rated as having improved academically, and 267 pupils (70.4%) were rated as having improved in their social adjustment. Both criteria for Objective 2.0 (identification of problem areas and improvement in the problem areas) were met. Thus, Objective 2.0 was achieved. The numbers and percents of pupils rated in the highest category, "Marked Improvement," were 68 (17.9%) for Referral Reasons, 51 (13.5%) for academic improvement, and 62 (16.4%) for social adjustment. These are encouraging results for pupils who are in the project because of disruptive influences.

Objective 3.0 was to serve as a home-school-community liaison to promote understanding and provide assistance for the adjustment of pupils to the school environment. It had two criteria. Criterion 3.1 required that 80% of the pupils served would perceive that the HSCA provided such understanding and assistance; it was assessed using the Pupil Questionnaire. Criterion 3.2, which required similar perceptions by 80% of professional staff members who referred pupils to the HSCA, was assessed using the Professional Staff Survey. A third instrument, the HSCA Log Sheet, documented the weekly activities performed by the HSCA in attempting to meet the needs and goals of the pupils.

The pupils were surveyed during February 1990 with the locally constructed Pupil Questionnaire. The Pupil Questionnaire was designed to determine student perceptions of the HSCA role in promoting adjustment in the home-school-community environment and to provide data regarding the student's adjustment to school.

Of the 252 Pupil Questionnaires that were distributed, 236 (93.7%) were returned. In the following analysis, all percents are based on the number of pupils returning the survey. The results of the survey are summarized in Tables 8-12.

Table 8

Frequency and Percent of Pupils Reporting
Benefit From Specific HSCA Activities
N=236

Which of the ways was used by the Home-School-Community Agent to help you.	Pupils Responding Yes	
	Frequency	Percent
Took time to discuss my problems with me	201	85.2
Visited my home	125	53.0
Arranged meeting(s) with teachers	108	45.8
Visited a community agency on my behalf such as CMACAO, Health Center, or counseling agency	37	15.7

Table 9

Frequency and Percent of Pupils
Perceiving the HSCAs' Promotion of Understanding
N=236

Item	Pupil Response					
	Yes		No		No Response	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
When a student has trouble in school or with a teacher, it is a good idea to talk it over with the Home-School-Community Agent.	222	94.1	13	5.5	1	0.4
The Home-School-Community Agent is an understanding person to talk with.	225	95.3	9	3.8	2	0.8
I think I understand my own problems better since talking with Home-School-Community Agent.	197	83.5	34	14.4	5	2.1

Table 10

Frequency and Percent of Pupils'
Perceptions of the Helpfulness of the HSCA
N=236

Item	Pupil Response					
	Yes		No		No Response	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
The Home-School-Community Agent was helpful to me	220	93.2	13	5.5	3	1.3
Pupils with problems can get help from the Home-School-Community-Agent.	225	95.3	7	3.0	4	1.7

Table 11

Frequency and Percent of Pupils
Reporting Adjustment to School
N=236

Item	Pupil Response					
	Yes		No		No Response	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
I feel my classroom attendance has improved since meeting with the Home-School-Community Agent	164	69.5	69	29.2	3	1.3
I am keeping up with my assignments better since working with the Home-School-Community Agent.	168	71.2	58	24.6	10	4.2

Table 12

Frequency and Percent of Pupils'
Perceived Improvement in Getting Along with Others
N=236

Since I talked to the Home-School-Community Agent, I am getting along better with	Pupils Responding Yes	
	Frequency	Percent
My teachers	190	80.5
My family	95	40.3
My friends	92	39.0

When asked which activities HSCAs had performed in order to help them, pupils indicated the following: "Took time to discuss my problems with me" (85.2%); "Visited my home" (53.9%); "Arranged meeting with my teacher(s)" (45.8%); and "Visited community agency on my behalf such as CMACAO, health center, or counseling agency" (15.7%) (see Table 8).

Data for survey items dealing with pupils' perceptions of the promotion of understanding by the HSCA are presented in Table 9. When asked if it was a good idea to talk over their school-related problems with the HSCA, 94.1% of the pupils responded "yes". A large majority (95.3%) of the pupils also agreed that the HSCA was understanding to talk with. When the pupils were asked if they thought they understood their own problems better since talking with the HSCA, 83.5% indicated that this was the case. The average percent of positive responses to the three items concerning promotion of understanding was 91.0%.

The survey items in Table 10 indicate pupil perceptions of assistance (helpfulness) provided by the HSCA. The percent of pupils who perceived that the HSCA was helpful to them was 93.2%; 95.3% of the pupils agreed that pupils with problems could get help from the HSCA.

Table 11 presents pupil's perceptions of their adjustment to school since their entry into the HSCA program. Improved classroom attendance was indicated by 69.5% of the pupils, while 71.2% of the pupils indicated improvement in keeping up with their assignments.

Additional evidence of pupil adjustment (to teachers, family, and friends) can be found in Table 12. Pupils indicated that, since talking to the Home-School-Community Agent, 80.5% were getting along better with their teachers, 40.3% were getting along better with their families, and 39.0% were getting along better with their friends.

Criterion 3.1 required that 80% of the pupils served would perceive the HSCA as promoting understanding and providing assistance for the adjustment to the school environment. The Pupil Questionnaire data cited above indicate that this criterion to objective 3.0 was attained. Well over 80% of the pupils perceived the HSCA as promoting understanding (see Table 9), and well over 80% also perceived the HSCA as providing assistance (see Table 10).

The professional staff members were surveyed in February 1989 with the locally constructed Professional Staff Survey. The Professional Staff Survey was designed to determine perceptions of school professional staff regarding the HSCAs role as a liaison between the school and the home and the community. The surveys were sent to those members of the school professional staffs who had referred pupils for inclusion in the HSCA program. A total of 177 Professional Staff Surveys was distributed. Of this number, 125 (70.6%) were returned.

Table 13 contains the percent of staff ratings on items regarding the value of HSCA services. In further analysis the strongly agree and agree categories were combined to determine whether Criterion 3.2 was attained. Analysis of the

Table 13

Professional Staff Perceptions of the
Effectiveness of the HSCA Project
N=125

Item	Number Responding	Average Response	Percent SA (5)	A (4)	U (3)	D (2)	SD (1)
The Home-School-Community Agent's role as a liaison between home, school, community is important.	125	4.9	91.2	8.0	0.8	0.0	0.0
The Home-School-Community Agent has been effective in providing liaison between home, school, and community.	125	4.7	80.8	11.2	6.4	1.6	0.0
The services of the Home-School-Community Agent to the total instructional effort at your building are valuable.	125	4.6	74.4	18.4	4.8	2.4	0.0
The student(s) you referred to the Home-School-Community Agent showed some improvement.	125	4.1	35.2	46.4	12.8	4.8	0.8
The Home-School-Community Agent helps the disruptive student(s) make positive adjustment to the following areas:							
The school	122	4.3	50.8	36.9	7.4	4.9	0.0
The home	117	3.9	26.5	41.0	29.1	3.4	0.0
The community	117	3.9	27.4	35.9	33.3	3.4	0.0
The Home-School-Community Agent provides insights that are helpful toward positive adjustment of disruptive students to school.	123	4.5	66.7	24.4	4.9	4.1	0.0

Note. The rating scale is: SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, U = Undecided, D = Disagree, and SD = Strongly Disagree.

data indicated that 99.2% of the respondents considered the HSCAs role to be important, and 92.0% of the respondents viewed the HSCA as effective in the role of a liaison between the school, the home, and the community. The services of the HSCA to the total instructional effort of the school was considered valuable by 92.8% of the respondents.

A total of 81.6% of respondents reported improvement among the pupils they had referred to the HSCA for assistance. Members of the professional staff generally agreed that the services of the HSCA helped the pupils adjust to school, home, and community. Positive ratings were given by 87.7% of the respondents for adjustment to school, by 67.5% for adjustment to home, and 63.2% for adjustment to the community. Insights provided by the HSCA were also considered to be helpful toward positive pupil adjustment by 91.1% of the respondents. These percents are based on the number of respondents answering a given item.

Respondents also indicated the frequency to which the HSCA used various activities to help the pupils they had referred to the program (see Table 14). To simplify analysis the positive categories ("frequently" and "sometimes") were combined. The percent of respondents indicating that these activities took place was 90.5% for home visits, 90.2% for conferences with the staff members who had referred pupils, 90.2% for pupil conferences, 78.7% for pupil conferences in which parents or professional staff were also included, and 72.3% for enlisting help from community agencies. In addition, 48.2% indicated that the HSCA had appeared in court in regard to pupils. These percents are based on the number of respondents answering a given item. The high percentage of respondents that felt the HSCA used pupil conferences as a means of solving a pupil's problem is consistent with the data collected on the Pupil Survey and HSCA Log Sheets.

Criterion 3.2, that 80% of the professional staff who referred pupils to the HSCA would perceive the HSCA as promoting understanding and providing assistance to pupils, was attained. Substantially more than 80% of the respondents gave positive responses to all items of the Professional Staff Survey directly related to this criterion (importance of HSCA role, effectiveness of HSCA as home-school-community liaison, importance of HSCA services to total instructional effort of the school, and insights or understandings).

The HSCA Log Sheet is an evaluation instrument which provides documentation of the activities of a HSCA during a selected week. Each HSCA was randomly assigned two separate weeks during the period from December 4, 1989, to March 9, 1990, for which all activities were to be logged. Table 15 contains the average responses from the instrument and indicates the extent of the various activities in the typical week of a HSCA during the time period sampled.

The HSCAs logged 18 job-related activities in the HSCA Weekly Log Sheet. These activities can be grouped into three roles: guidance, liaison, and school support. Guidance involves direct counseling with pupils individually or in small and large groups. The liaison role involves the HSCA intervening on behalf of the pupil with a third party. This party may be a parent, teacher, administrator, community agency or school psychologist. The last role, school support, involves those activities that support the overall success of the school program. Examples might include telephone calls, lunchroom duty, hall

duty, general office work, transporting pupils, and supervising special activities. The average HSCA week included 38.7 contacts involving individual or group guidance for a total of 9.7 hours; 33.8 liaison activities involving parents, school personnel, and/or community agencies for a total of 9.7 hours; and 5.7 hours involving an average of 17.8 support activities. The documentation provided in the HSCA Log Sheet along with data from the Pupil Questionnaire (Criterion 3.1) and the Professional Staff Survey (Criterion 3.2) give a clear indication that Objective 3.0 was achieved.

Table 14

Actions Taken by the HSCA
As Perceived by the Professional Staff
N=125

Item	Number Responding	Average Response	Percent F (5)	S (4)	U (3)	I (2)	N (1)
Made home visits	116	4.5	60.3	30.2	5.2	4.3	0.0
Held conference(s) with you concerning the student(s)	123	4.4	60.2	30.1	0.8	3.3	5.7
Had conferences with student(s) you referred	123	4.7	80.5	9.8	4.9	4.1	0.8
Arranged student conferences at school which included parents and/or professional staff	122	4.0	44.3	34.4	6.6	8.2	6.6
Enlisted help from community agencies (such as CMACAO, CETA, Health Centers, Etc.)	119	4.0	40.3	31.9	20.2	3.4	4.2
Appeared in court in regard to the student(s)	110	3.3	23.6	24.5	27.3	7.3	17.3

Note. The rating scale is: 5 = Frequently, 4 = Sometimes, 3 = Undecided, 2 = Infrequently, and 1 = Never

Table 15

Weekly Averages of Activities Logged per HSCA on the HSCA Weekly Log Sheets (N=19)

	Average Number of Sessions/ Contacts Per Week	Average Number of Students Per Session	Average Number of Minutes Per Session
Guidance			
Individual Conferences	28.2	1.0	13.2
Small Group Conferences	6.2	3.5	23.3
Large Group Conferences (Classroom Size)	1.1	26.2	30.9
Job Development and Career Education Instruction	1.3	1.9	16.2
Miscellaneous Guidance	1.8	1.8	3.6
Liaison			
Parent Conferences (in-school)	4.5		18.5
Teacher/Staff Conferences	10.6		10.0
Home/Visits	7.6		25.4
Referrals to Community Agencies	2.6		13.4
Follow-Ups of Referrals to Community Agencies	1.5		12.2
Referrals to School Special Services Staff (Psychologists, Guidance Counselor, etc.)	3.2		9.3
Follow-Ups to Special Staff	1.8		9.6
Miscellaneous Liaison	1.9		48.9
Support Services			
Telephone	1.7		7.2
Transport Students	0.5	1.8	30.3
Monitor Halls/Lunchroom/ Grounds/School Vicinity	8.6		25.6
Free Lunch Applications/ School Lunch Program	2.0		13.4
Miscellaneous Support	5.0		13.2

Objective 4.0 was to provide at least two inservice sessions to program personnel such that at least 80% of the inservice participants would rate each session as valuable in providing information that would assist them in carrying out their program responsibilities. There were four inservice meetings for HSCAs in the school year. The topics and dates of these meetings were as follows: Orientation for the 1989-90 School Year, September 5, 1989; Case Management and Follow-Through, October 2, 1989; The Columbus Area Community Mental Health Center's Adolescent Outreach Program, November 6, 1989; and Juvenile Narcotics and Youth Violence/Crime Sections of the Columbus Police Department and Columbus Schools PEAK and I-PASS Programs, December 4, 1989. All four meetings were evaluated by the HSCAs using the General Inservice Evaluation Form, except that a modified version of this form was used to evaluate the orientation meeting. Both versions of the form are found in Appendix B, pages 39-41. The percent of HSCAs who agreed or strongly agreed that the meetings provided information that would assist them in their duties were as follows, in chronological order: 100.0%, 94.4%, 57.1%, and 100.0%. Since one of the meetings received positive ratings by less than the requisite 80% of HSCAs, Objective 4.0 was not attained as written. However, the percent of positive ratings over all four meetings was 87.7%. Overall ratings from the four orientation meetings are summarized in Table 16. Respondents rated items using a five-point scale ranging from Strongly Agree (5) to Strongly Disagree (1).

Table 16

Average Responses and Percent of Response
for Reactions to Inservice Statements

Statements	Number Responding	Average Response	Percent SA (5)	A (4)	U (3)	D (2)	SD (1)
I think this was a very worthwhile inservice.	57	4.2	38.6	50.9	3.5	7.0	0.0
The information presented in this inservice will assist me in my program.	57	4.2	40.4	47.4	8.8	3.5	0.0
There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentations.	56	4.4	44.6	53.6	1.8	0.0	0.0
Questions were answered adequately.	55	4.4	45.5	50.9	1.8	1.8	0.0

Note: The rating scale key is: SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, U = Undecided, D = Disagree, and SD = Strongly Disagree.

Additional information was collected on the Orientation Inservice Evaluation Form using open-ended questions. Participants were asked to comment about the most and least valuable parts of the meetings, and about information they would like to have covered in future meetings. Only those open-ended comments which were made by three or more participants at any single session will be summarized here. However, the evaluation reports on individual sessions have been forwarded to the Department of Pupil Personnel and are available on request.

In regard to the most valuable parts of inservice meetings, the following comments had frequencies of three or more in a meeting: the entire meeting presented by Columbus Police and Columbus Schools PEAK and I-PASS programs, a discussion on the duties of HSCAs and School Social Workers, and information on supportive service. In regard to least valuable parts of meetings, two items had a frequency of three or more comments at a meeting: "None" or "Nothing" in regard to the meeting with Columbus Police and PEAK/I-PASS programs, and a meeting which HSCAs felt was geared more to School Social Workers than to HSCAs. The only suggestion for future meetings with a frequency of three or more was for information geared specifically to the HSCA program.

Summary/Recommendations

The project had four objectives. The first objective stated that 50% of the selected pupils who are served by the HSCA for the entire treatment period will show a more positive attitude toward teachers, education, and school behavior. The second objective stated that at least 50% of the pupils in the evaluation sample will demonstrate a positive adjustment to those elements that interfere with their success in school. This objective required identification of those elements which appeared to be obstructing pupil achievement, and evidence of positive adjustment by at least 50% of the pupils in the evaluation sample. The third objective, to serve as a home-school-community liaison to promote understanding and provide assistance for pupil adjustment to the school environment, required that both 80% of the pupils served and 80% of the professional staff members referring pupils to the program would perceive that the HSCA promoted understanding and assistance to pupils for adjustment to the school environment. It also required documentation of weekly activities of the HSCA in carrying out this objective. The fourth objective was to provide at least two inservice sessions to project personnel, such that at least 80% of the participants would rate each session as valuable in providing information that would assist them in their duties.

Objective 1.0 was not attained. Less than the requisite 50% of pupils (42.8%) showed improvement in their attitude as measured by the Total Score of the Demos D Scale (DDS). Average change scores at two grade levels were found to be statistically significant in three of the four subtest scales (attitude toward teachers, attitude toward education, and attitude toward school behavior) and in the total score. In grade 11 these change scores indicated significant improvement, while in grade 7 the change scores were significant in the wrong direction.

The primary purpose of the DDS is to determine the probabilities of a pupil dropping out of school. The assumption is made that students who are likely to drop out of school have a poor attitude about teachers and school. The test publisher states that the DDS may be used to identify students with strongly negative attitudes toward teachers and school but cautions that DDS scores be used with all other available information concerning the student. It is not advisable that DDS scores by themselves be used for definitive diagnostic purposes.

The first criterion of Objective 2.0, identification of those elements which appeared to be obstructing pupil achievement, was evaluated on the basis of the Pupil Entry Information Sheet. The instrument provided individual pupil data which could be used by the HSCA, as well as for project evaluation. The three most frequent reasons for referral to the overall project were poor grades, disruptiveness, and hostility to authority. The most frequent referral reason in high school was disruptiveness, while the number one referral reason in middle school was attendance problem. Nearly three-fourths (74.2%) of the pupils in the sample were referred for two or more reasons.

The second criterion of Objective 2.0, evidence of pupil adjustment by at least 50% of the pupils sampled, was primarily evaluated on the basis of individual data from the Pupil Census Forms. As rated by the HSCAs, 67.3% of pupils in the evaluation sample showed evidence of improvement in relation to their original referral reasons (49.3% showing "improvement," and 17.9% showing "marked improvement"). HSCAs also gave positive ratings to 57.5% of the pupils regarding academic improvement, and 70.4% of the pupils regarding social adjustment. Further verification of the attainment of this criterion was provided by the Pupil Questionnaire and the Professional Staff Questionnaire. Pupils responding to the Pupil Questionnaire reported that they were getting along better with their teachers (80.5%), families (40.3%), and friends (39.0%) since talking with the HSCA. Of those who responded to the Professional Staff Questionnaire, 81.6% reported improvement among the pupils they had referred to the HSCA for assistance. The data indicated that both criteria for Objective 2.0 were met; thus Objective 2.0 was achieved.

The first criterion of Objective 3.0 was that 80% of the pupils served would perceive that the HSCA promoted understanding and provided assistance for their adjustment to the school environment. Analysis of the Pupil Questionnaire indicated that well over 80% of the pupils perceived the HSCA as promoting understanding, and well over 80% also perceived the HSCA as providing assistance. These data indicate that Criterion 3.1 was achieved. In addition, a majority of the pupils perceived that they had actually improved in each of the following areas: classroom attendance (69.5%), keeping up with assignments (71.2%), and getting along better with teachers (80.5%). A number of pupils also perceived that they were getting along better with their families (40.3%) and friends (39.0%). In regard to specific activities most often performed by the HSCA on behalf of the pupils, 85.2% of the pupils reported HSCA-pupil conferences, 53.9% reported home visits, and 45.8% reported arrangement of conferences with their teachers.

The second criterion of Objective 3.0 was that 80% of the professional staff who referred pupils to the HSCA would perceive that the HSCA promoted understanding and provided assistance for the adjustment of pupils to the school environment. Analysis of the Professional Staff Survey indicated that 99.2% of the respondents viewed the HSCAs role of home-school-community liaison to be important, and 92.0% rated the HSCA as effective in providing the liaison services. Insights or understandings provided by the HSCA were also considered helpful toward positive pupil adjustment by 91.1% of the respondents answering this item. The data from the Professional Staff Survey indicate that this criterion of Objective 3.0 was met.

Objective 3.0 also required documentation of HSCAs weekly activities to meet the goals and needs of the pupils. Analysis of the HSCA Log Sheet indicated that an average HSCAs week included 38.7 contacts involving individual or group guidance for 9.7 hours; 33.8 liaison activities involving parents, school personnel, and/or community agencies for a total of 9.7 hours; and 5.7 hours served in various school support activities.

Objective 4.0 was to provide at least two inservice sessions to program personnel such that at least 80% of the inservice participants would rate each session as valuable in providing information that will assist them in carrying out their program responsibilities. This objective was not attained, since one of the four inservice meetings which were provided received positive ratings by less than the requisite 80% of HSCAs. However, the percent of positive ratings over all four meetings was 87.7%.

The data collected for the 1989-90 Home-School-Community Agent project presented mixed findings. Although the project was considered valuable by pupils, HSCAs, and school staff, improvement of pupil attitudes as measured by the Demos D Scale was less than desired. The project met two of its four objectives. An administrative decision has already been made not to continue the project in the 1990-91 school year. It is recommended that alternative methods and/or program(s) be established to fill the need for helping disruptive pupils make positive adjustments to those elements in their lives that interfere with their success in school.

Note: At the time of the original writing of this report an administrative decision had been made to discontinue the HSCA program. However, this decision was later reversed. The program has been implemented in the 1990-91 school year.

References

Demos, G.D.(1980). The Demos D (Dropout) Scale. Los Angeles, California: Western Psychological Services.

Appendix A
Dropout Probabilities by Grade

		Posttest Dropout Probability Categories					
		5	25	50	70	90	Total
Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	25	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	50	0 0.0	0 0.0	15 60.0	4 16.0	0 0.0	19 76.0
	70	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 8.0	1 4.0	1 4.0	4 16.0
	90	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 8.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 8.0
	Total	0 0.0	0 0.0	19 76.0	5 20.0	1 4.0	25 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 2. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Six

		Posttest Dropout Probability Categories					
		5	25	50	70	90	Total
Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	25	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	50	0 0.0	0 0.0	41 91.1	2 4.4	1 2.2	44 97.8
	70	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	90	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 2.2	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 2.2
	Total	0 0.0	0 0.0	42 93.3	2 4.4	1 2.2	45 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 3. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Seven

		Posttest Dropout Probability Categories					
		5	25	50	70	90	Total
Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	25	0 0.0	0 0.0	3 7.7	0 0.0	0 0.0	3 7.7
	50	0 0.0	0 0.0	31 79.5	0 0.0	2 5.1	33 84.6
	70	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	3 7.7	3 7.7
	90	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	Total	0 0.0	0 0.0	34 87.2	0 0.0	5 12.8	39 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 4. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Eight

		Posttest Dropout Probability Categories					
		5	25	50	70	90	Total
Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	25	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 2.9	0 0.0	0 2.9	1 2.8
	50	0 0.0	0 0.0	21 61.8	3 8.8	1 2.9	25 73.5
	70	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 2.9	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 2.9
	90	0 0.0	0 0.0	4 11.8	1 2.9	2 5.9	7 20.6
	Total	0 0.0	0 0.0	27 79.4	4 11.8	3 8.8	34 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 5. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Nine

		Posttest Dropout Probability Categories					
		5	25	50	70	90	Total
Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	25	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	50	0 0.0	0 0.0	18 94.7	0 0.0	0 0.0	18 94.7
	70	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	90	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 5.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 5.3
	Total	0 0.0	0 0.0	19 100.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	19 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 6. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Ten

		Posttest Dropout Probability Categories					
		5	25	50	70	90	Total
Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	25	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	50	0 0.0	0 0.0	13 76.5	0 0.0	0 0.0	13 76.5
	70	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	90	0 0.0	0 0.0	4 23.5	0 0.0	0 0.0	4 23.5
	Total	0 0.0	0 0.0	17 100.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	17 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 7. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Eleven

		Posttest Dropout Probability Categories					
		5	25	50	70	90	Total
Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	25	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	50	0 0.0	0 0.0	14 93.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	14 93.3
	70	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 6.7	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 6.7
	90	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	Total	0 0.0	0 0.0	15 100.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	15 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 8. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Twelve

Appendix B
Instruments

Numbers in parenthesis are
for purposes of Data Processing

DPPP
HSCA
PUPIL ENTRY INFORMATION SHEET

PROGRAM ☐☐☐☐☐ (1-5)
COST CENTER ☐☐☐ (6-8)
SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ (9-17)

HSCA _____
School _____

Student Name First M.I. Last	Student Number (18-23)	Grade (24-25)	REFERRAL REASON(S) (39-52)														Name and Position of Referrer	
			Hostile to Auth.	Teacher Conflict	Law-Court Conflict	Class Cutting	Attendance Prob.	Truancy	Family/Home Prob.	Peer Conflict	Poor Grades	Poor Attitude	Drugs/Alcohol	Health Problem	Disruptive	Other (specify)	Position	Name

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TEACHER NUMBER									PROGRAM CODE				
4	1	5	3	6	5	8	1	0	9	0	0	5	3

STUDENT						SCHOOL			GRADE		SEX
8	3	0	5	7	7	0	2	1	1	0	M

MALE ●

FEMALE ○

TOTAL DAYS OF PROGRAM ENROLLMENT			TOTAL DAYS OF PROGRAM ATTENDANCE			HOURS OF INSTRUCTION PER WEEK			
1	2	3	4	5	6				
1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0

A1702

NCS Trans Opnr 08 8153 65

COLUMBUS PUBLIC SCHOOLS Columbus, Ohio PUPIL CENSUS FORM

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	M I	SEX	TEACHER NUMBER
			M	415365810

SCHOOL		H R	GRADE			
EAST HS	8(21)	0001	10	LEE	WILLIAMS	8)

USE A NUMBER 2 PENCIL. ERASE COMPLETELY WHEN MAKING CORRECTIONS.

1.HAS THIS PUPIL HAD ANY INVOLVEMENT WITH THE COURT?

YES NO

2.HOW MANY MONTHS HAS THIS PUPIL BEEN SERVED BY THE PROGRAM?

1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 MORE

3.NUMBER OF CONTACTS WITH THIS PUPIL?

0 1-3 4-6 7-10 11 OR MORE

4.NUMBER OF IN-SCHOOL CONFERENCES HELD REGARDING THIS PUPIL?

0 1-3 4-6 7-10 11 OR MORE

5.NUMBER OF HOME VISITS MADE REGARDING THIS PUPIL?

0 1-3 4-6 7-10 11 OR MORE

6.DID YOU REFER THIS PUPIL TO A COMMUNITY AGENCY?

YES NO

7.WHAT IMPROVEMENT HAS PUPIL SHOWN ACADEMICALLY THIS YEAR?

MARKED IMPROVEMENT IMPROVEMENT NO IMPROVEMENT

8.RATE PUPIL'S SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT PROGRESS THIS YEAR.

MARKED IMPROVEMENT IMPROVEMENT NO IMPROVEMENT

9.FINAL OUTCOME - CONCERNING THE ORIGINAL REFERRAL REASON(S)?

MARKED IMPROVEMENT IMPROVEMENT NO IMPROVEMENT

PUPIL QUESTIONNAIRE
HOME-SCHOOL-COMMUNITY AGENT PROGRAM

You have met with _____ the Home School Community Agent in your school, during this school year. The following questions give you a chance to express your feelings about how the Home-School-Community Agent has helped you. This is not a test. You do not have to give your name. When you are finished, fold your completed questionnaire and give it to a secretary in the school office, who will put it in the school mail. Thanks for your help.

Section I

Please circle all responses that apply to each statement.

1. Which of these ways was used by the Home-School-Community Agent to help you?
   - A. Visited my home.
   - B. Arranged a meeting(s) with my teacher(s).
   - C. Took time to discuss my problems with me.
   - D. Visited a community agency on my behalf, such as CMACAO, Health Center, or counseling agency.
2. Since I talked to the Home-School-Community Agent, I am getting along better with
   - A. my teachers
   - B. my family
   - C. my friends

Section II

Please circle yes or no to each statement.

3.	When a student has trouble in school or with a teacher, it is a good idea to talk it over with the Home-School-Community Agent.	Yes	No
4.	The Home-School-Community Agent is an understanding person to talk with.	Yes	No
5.	I think I understand my own problems better since talking with the Home-School-Community Agent.	Yes	No
6.	The Home-School-Community Agent was helpful to me.	Yes	No
7.	I feel my classroom attendance has improved since meeting with the Home-School-Community Agent.	Yes	No
8.	I am keeping up with my assignments better since working with the Home-School-Community Agent.	Yes	No
9.	Students with problems can get help from the Home-School-Community Agent.	Yes	No

DES 1/89

HOME-SCHOOL-COMMUNITY AGENT PROJECT
PROFESSIONAL STAFF SURVEY

Questions 1-6. Please circle the number after each statement that indicates your degree of agreement with each statement.

Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The Home-School-Community Agent's role as a liaison between home, school, community is important.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The Home-School-Community Agent has been effective in providing liaison between home, school, and community.	5	4	3	2	1
3. The services of the Home-School-Community Agent to the total instructional effort at your building are valuable.	5	4	3	2	1
4. The student(s) you referred to the Home-School-Community Agent showed some improvement.	5	4	3	2	1
5. The Home-School-Community Agent helps the disruptive student(s) make positive adjustments in the following areas (please rate all three areas):					
a. The school	5	4	3	2	1
b. The home	5	4	3	2	1
c. The community	5	4	3	2	1
6. The Home-School-Community Agent provides insights that are helpful toward positive adjustment of disruptive students to school	5	4	3	2	1

Questions 7-12. Please indicate the frequency that the Home-School-Community Agent did each of the following in order to solve the problem(s) of student(s) you referred by circling the appropriate number after each statement.

	Frequently	Sometimes	Undecided	Infrequently	Never
7. Made home visits	5	4	3	2	1
8. Held conference(s) with you concerning the student(s)	5	4	3	2	1
9. Had conferences with student(s) you referred	5	4	3	2	1
10. Arranged student conferences at school which included parents and/or professional staff	5	4	3	2	1
11. Enlisted help from community agencies (such as CMACAO, CETA, Health Centers, etc.)	5	4	3	2	1
12. Appeared in court in regard to the student(s)	5	4	3	2	1

DES 1/89

DPPF
Home-School-Community Agents
Weekly Log Sheet

Your week to be logged is _____.
Please return to Program Evaluation within two days.

School
Name

LABEL

(1-5) Program Code	9	0	0	5	3					
(6-8) Cost Center #										
(9-17) Social Security #										

Note: Use Individual Conference line when only one student is involved. Two or more students, but less than classroom size, would be considered a Small Group.

	Number of Sessions/ Contacts Per Week	Number of Students Per Session	Number of Minutes Per Session
Guidance, Home/School			
Individual Conferences	_____	1	_____
Small Group Conferences	_____	_____	_____
Large Group Conferences (Classroom Size)	_____	_____	_____
Parent Conferences (in-school)	_____		_____
Teacher/Staff Conferences	_____		_____
Home/Visits	_____		_____
Referrals to Community Agencies	_____		_____
Follow-Ups of Referrals to Community Agencies	_____		_____
Referrals to School Special Services Staff (Psychologists, Guidance Counselor, etc.)	_____		_____
Follow-Ups to Special Staff	_____		_____
Job Development and Career Education Instruction	_____	_____	_____
Other_____	_____	_____	_____
Other_____	_____	_____	_____
Other_____	_____	_____	_____

DPE 11/89

EVALSRVCS/P509/RPTFHSC90

ECIA CHAPTER 1 AND DPPF
ORIENTATION INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM
1989-90 ORIENTATION

Circle only the program(s) you are in:

ECIA Chapter 1 Programs:
(1) ADK
(2) CLEAR-Reading Recovery
(3) CLEAR-Non-Public (1-8)
(4) CLEAR-Primary-Whole Language
(5) CLEAR-Elementary (1-5)
(6) CLEAR-Elementary-CAI
(7) CLEAR-Middle (6-8)
(8) CLEAR-Middle-CAI
(9) MIC-Elementary-CAI
(10) MIC-Elementary-CBE
(11) MIC-Middle-CBE

DPPF Programs:
(12) Secondary Reading (Regular)
(13) Secondary Reading (CAI)
(14) HSCA

Other (Specify)
(15) _____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree with statements 1-4, in rating the overall day of inservice.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I think this was a very worthwhile inservice.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The information presented in this inservice will assist me in my program.	5	4	3	2	1
3. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentations.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Questions were answered adequately.	5	4	3	2	1

Circle the number that indicates how you would rate each of the following portions of today's inservice in regard to interest and usefulness of presentations.

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
5. Program Coordinators' Mini-session					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
c. Clarity of instructions	5	4	3	2	1

****
* *
* Please turn over for questions 6-9 *
* *
****

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
6. Evaluation Presentation					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
c. Clarity of instructions	5	4	3	2	1

7. What was the most valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

8. What was the least valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

9. What additional information or topics would you like to see covered in future meetings?

_____

_____

_____

GENERAL INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM
1989-90

Inservice Topic: _____

Presenter(s): _____

Date: ____/____/____ (e.g., 03/05/90)
MM DD YY

Session (Check only one): _____ all day _____a.m. _____ p.m.

Circle only the program(s) you are in:

ESEA Chapter 1 Programs:
(1) ADK
(2) CLEAR-Reading Recovery
(3) CLEAR-Non-Public (1-8)
(4) CLEAR-Primary-Whole Language
(5) CLEAR-Elementary-Regular (2-5)
(6) CLEAR-Elementary-CAI (3-5)
(7) CLEAR-Middle-Regular (6-8)
(8) CLEAR-Middle-CAI (6-8)
(9) MIC-Elementary-CAI (3-5)
(10) MIC-Elementary-CBE (3-5)
(11) MIC-Middle-CBE (6-7)

DPPF Programs:
(12) Secondary Reading Program (Regular)
(13) Secondary Reading Program (CAI)
(14) HSCA
(15) SSW

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with statements 1-4.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I think this was a very worthwhile meeting.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The information presented in this meeting will assist me in my program.	5	4	3	2	1
3. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentation.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Questions were answered adequately.	5	4	3	2	1

5. What was the most valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

6. What was the least valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

7. Please list any additional information or topics you would like to see covered in future meetings. a) _____

b) _____

c) _____

EVALSRVCS/P509/RPTFHSC90